

Faster fully compressed pattern matching by recompression

Artur Jeż *

Institute of Computer Science
University of Wrocław
ul. Joliot-Curie 15, 50-383 Wrocław, Poland
aje@cs.uni.wroc.pl

May 11, 2012

Abstract

In this paper, a fully compressed pattern matching problem is studied. The compression is represented by straight-line programs (SLPs), i.e. a context-free grammars generating exactly one string; the term fully means that *both* the pattern *and* the text are given in the compressed form. The problem is approached using a recently developed technique of local recompression: the SLPs are refactored, so that substrings of the pattern and text are encoded in both SLPs in the same way. To this end, the SLPs are *locally decompressed* and then *recompressed* in a uniform way.

This technique yields an $\mathcal{O}((n+m) \log M \log(n+m))$ algorithm for compressed pattern matching, where n (m) is the size of the compressed representation of the text (pattern, respectively), while M is the size of the decompressed pattern. Since $M \leq 2^m$, this substantially improves the previously best $\mathcal{O}(m^2 n)$ algorithm.

Since LZ compression standard reduces to SLP with $\log(N/n)$ overhead and in $\mathcal{O}(n \log(N/n))$ time, the presented algorithm can be applied also to the fully LZ-compressed pattern matching problem, yielding an $\mathcal{O}(s \log s \log M)$ running time, where $s = n \log(N/n) + m \log(M/m)$.

1 Introduction

Compression and Straight-Line Programms

Due to ever-increasing amount of data, compression methods are widely applied in order to decrease the data's size. Still, the stored data is accessed and processed. Decompressing it on each such an occasion basically wastes the gain of reduced storage size; especially that we do not even know in advance, which data is relevant to our queries and we decompress many completely irrelevant files. Thus there is a large demand for algorithms dealing directly with the compressed data, without the explicit decompression. The commonly investigated problem is the *compressed pattern matching* i.e. a pattern matching in which the text is supplied in a compressed form.

Processing compressed data is not as hopeless, as it may seem: it is a popular outlook, that compression basically extracts the hidden structure of the text and if the compression rate is high, the data has a lot of internal structure. And it is natural to assume, that such a structure will help devising methods dealing directly with the compressed representation. Indeed, efficient algorithms for fundamental text operations (pattern matching, equality testing, etc.) are known for various practically used compression methods (LZ, LZW, their variants, etc.) [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 18].

The compression standards differ in the main idea as well as in details. Thus when devising algorithms for compressed data, quite early one needs to focus on the exact compression method, to which the algorithm is applied. The most practical (and challenging) choice is one of the widely used standards, like LZW or LZ. However, a different approach is also pursued: for some applications (and most of theory-oriented considerations) it would be useful to *model* one of the practical compression standard by a more mathematically well-founded method. This idea, among other, lays at the foundations of the notion of *Straight-Line Programms* (SLP), which are simply context-free grammars generating exactly one string.

*Supported by NCN grant number DEC-2011/01/D/ST6/07164, 2011–2014 and by a scholarship funded by the Human Capital Programme.

SLPs are the most popular theoretical model of compression. This is on one hand motivated by a simple, ‘clean’ and appealing definition, on the other hand, they model the LZ compression standard: each LZ compressed text can be converted into an equivalent SLP with only $\log(N/n)$ overhead and in $\mathcal{O}(n \log(N/n))$ time (where N is the size of the decompressed text [19]), while each SLP can be converted to an equivalent LZ with just a constant overhead (and in linear time).

The approach of modelling LZ by SLPs in order to develop efficient algorithms turned out to be fruitful: the recent state-of-the-art (and is some sense optimal) algorithm for pattern matching in LZ-compressed texts changes the LZ-compression into the SLP-one as its first step [4]. To author’s best knowledge, there are no algorithms for FCPM specific for LZ, instead, the translation to SLP is used in such a case. On the other hand, algorithmic problems for SLP-compressed input strings were considered and successfully solved [13, 14, 18].

Problem statement

The problem considered in this paper is the *fully compressed membership problem* (FCPM), i.e. we are given a text of length N and pattern of length M , represented by SLPs of size n and m , respectively. We are to answer, whether the pattern appears in the text and give a compact representation of all such appearances in the text.

Previous and related results

The first algorithmic result dealing with the SLPs is for the compressed equality testing, i.e. the question whether two SLPs represent the same text. This was solved by Plandowski in 1994 [18], with $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ running time. The first solution for FCPM by Karpiński et al. followed a year later [12], its main drawback was that the proposed algorithm did not return positions of all pattern appearances in the text. Next, a polynomial algorithm for computing various combinatorial properties of SLP-generated texts, in particular pattern matching, was given by Gąsieniec et al. [7], the same authors presented also a faster randomised algorithm for FCPM [8]; both these algorithms returned compact representation of all pattern appearances. In 1997 Miyazaki et al. [17] constructed new $\mathcal{O}(n^2 m^2)$ algorithm for FCPM. A faster $\mathcal{O}(mn)$ algorithm for a special sub-case (restricting the form of SLPs) was given in 2000 by Hirao et al. [9]. Finally, in 2007, a state of the art $\mathcal{O}(nm^2)$ algorithm was given by Lifshits [13].

Concerning related problems, pattern matching in which the text is compressed using LZW method and the pattern is supplied uncompressed was proposed and recently a linear-time algorithm was given [3]. A variant in which the pattern is also compressed using LZW was also considered and a linear-time algorithm was recently developed [6]. Pattern matching for multiple patterns in LZW compressed text was also studied [5].

Similar work was carried also for the LZ-compressed text, for which the problem becomes substantially harder than in LZW case. In 2011, an $\mathcal{O}(n \log(N/n) + m)$ algorithm, which is in some sense optimal, was proposed [4].

The paradigm employed in all mentioned work and constructed algorithms, was to consider the combinatorial properties of strings described by appropriate compression methods; our method uses a new paradigm.

Our results and techniques

We give an $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log M \log(n + m))$ algorithm for FCPM, i.e. pattern matching problem in which both the text and the pattern are supplied as SLPs. This outperforms the previously-best $\mathcal{O}(m^2 n)$ algorithm [13].

Theorem 1. *Algorithm FCPM returns an $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m))$ representation of all pattern appearances, where n (m) is the size of the SLP-compressed text (pattern, respectively) and M is the size of the decompressed pattern. It runs in $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log M \log(n + m))$ time. The space consumption is $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m))$.*

This representation allows calculation of the number of pattern appearances, and if N fits in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ codewords, also the position of the first, last etc. pattern; in other case the space consumption increases to $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(N + M) \log(n + m))$.

Our approach to the problem is essentially different than all previously applied for compressed pattern matching. We do *not* consider any combinatorial properties of the encoded strings. Instead, we analyse and change the way strings are described by the SLPs in the instance. That is, we focus on the SLPs

alone, ignoring any properties of the encoded strings. Roughly speaking, our algorithm aims at having all the strings in the instance compressed ‘in the same way’. To achieve this goal, we decompress the SLPs. Since the compressed text can be exponentially long, we do this *locally*: we introduce explicit strings into the right-hand sides of the productions. Then, we recompress these explicit strings uniformly: roughly, a fixed pair of letters ab is replaced by a new letter c in both the string and the pattern; such a procedure is applied for every possible pair of letters. Since such pieces of text are compressed in the same way, we can ‘forget’ about the original substrings of the input and treat the introduced nonterminals as atomic letters. Such recompression shortens the pattern (and the text) significantly: roughly one ‘round’ of recompression in which every pair of letters that was present at the beginning of the ‘round’ is compressed shortens the encoded strings by a constant factor. Thus, there are $O(\log M)$ rounds.

Although it is not so hard to believe that this high level idea can work, it is much less believable that this can be turned into a fast, efficient and simple algorithm. However, by choosing wisely the parts of the text to be recompressed and keeping the overall size of the instance low, we manage to achieve the goal.

Similar techniques While application the idea of recompression to pattern matching is new, related approaches were previously employed: most notably the idea of replacing short strings by a fresh letter and iterating this procedure was used by Mehlhorn et al. [16], in their work on data structure for equality testing for dynamic strings (cf. also an improved implementation of a similar data structure by Brodal et al. [1]). They viewed this process as ‘hashing’. In particular their method can be straightforwardly applied to equality testing for SLPs, yielding a nearly quadratic algorithm (as observed by Gawrychowski [2]). However, the inside technical details of the construction makes extension to FCPM problematic: while this method can be used to build ‘canonical’ SLPs for the text and the pattern, there is no apparent way to control how these SLPs actually look like and how do they encode the strings.

In the area of compressed membership problems, from which the presented method emerge, recent work of Mathissen and Lohrey [15] already implemented the idea of replacing strings with fresh letters as well as modifications of the instance so that such replacement is possible. However, the replacement was not iterated, and the newly introduced letters could not be further compressed.

Other applications of the technique A more crude variant of recompression technique has been used in order to solve an old open problem regarding fully compressed membership problem for NFAs [10]. Furthermore, a variant of this method can also be applied in the area of word equations. While not claiming any essentially new results, the recompression approach yielded much simpler proofs and faster algorithms of many classical results in the area, like PSPACE algorithm for solving word equations, double exponential bound on the size of the solution, exponential bound on the exponent of periodicity, *etc.* [11].

Computational model and positions in text

Our algorithm uses RadixSort and we assume that the codeword is of size $\Omega(\log(n + m))$. However, we do not make such assumptions on N and M . Changing the model into pointer machine introduces a $\log(n + m)$ factor to the running time.

The position of the first appearance of the pattern in the text might be exponential in n , and so it is infeasible to output it within the given bounds. However, if we assume that N fits in a constant amount of codewords, our algorithm can also output the position of the first, last etc. position of the pattern.

2 Basic notions, outline of the algorithm

Straight line programmes

Formally, a *Straight-Line Programme* (SLP) is a context free grammar G over the alphabet Σ with a set of nonterminals $\mathcal{X}$, generating a one-word language. For normalisation reasons, it is assumed that G is in a *Chomsky normal form*, i.e. each production is either of the form $X \rightarrow YZ$ or $X \rightarrow a$. We denote the string defined by nonterminal A by $\text{val}(A)$, like *value*; this notion extends to $\text{val}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \Sigma)^*$ in the usual way. We also use $\text{first}[X_i]$ ($\text{last}[X_i]$) to denote the first (last, respectively) letter of $\text{val}(X_i)$. The tables $\text{first}[]$ and $\text{last}[]$ are stored by the algorithm FCPM.

Without loss of generality we may assume that Σ consists of consecutive natural numbers (starting from 1): it is enough to sort the input letters and number them $1, \dots, |\Sigma|$. During our algorithm, the alphabet Σ is increased many times and whenever this happens, the new letter is assigned number $|\Sigma| + 1$

(and Σ 's size increases by 1 as well). The $|\Sigma|$ does not become large in this way: it remains of size $\mathcal{O}((n+m)\log(n+m)\log M)$, see Lemma 8.

For our purposes it is more convenient to treat the two SLPs as a single context free grammar G with a set of nonterminals $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_{n+m}\}$, the text being given by X_{n+m} and the pattern by X_m . We assume, however, that X_m is not referenced by any other nonterminal. Furthermore, in our constructions, it is essential to *relax* the usual assumption that G is in a Chomsky normal form, instead we only require that G satisfies the conditions:

each X_i has exactly one production, which has at most 2 noterminals, (1a)

if X_j appears in the rule for X_i then $j < i$, (1b)

if $\text{val}(X_i) = \epsilon$ then X_i is not on the right-hand side of any production., (1c)

We refer to these conditions collectively as (1). Let $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$, then a substring $u \in \Sigma^+$ of α_i appears *explicitly* in the rule; this notion is introduced to distinguish them from the substrings of $\text{val}(X_i)$. Note that (1) does not exclude the case, when $X_i \rightarrow \epsilon$ and allowing such a possibility streamlines the analysis.

The size $|G|$ is the sum of length of the right-hand sides of G 's rules. The size of G kept by the algorithm will be small: $\mathcal{O}((n+m)\log(n+m))$, see Lemma 8.

There may be exponentially many appearances of the pattern in the text (consider text a^{2^n} and pattern a^{2^m}), and so naive outputting all of them is infeasible. Instead, our algorithm provides an $\mathcal{O}((n+m)\log(m+n))$ SLP, in which appearances of a designated letter correspond to the pattern appearance in the original instance.

(Non) crossing appearances

The main part of the presented FCPM consists of recompression, i.e. replacing strings appearing in $\text{val}(X_m)$ by shorter ones throughout $\text{val}(X_1), \dots, \text{val}(X_{n+m})$. In some cases, such replacing is harder, in other easier. It is intuitively clear, that this depends on the position of the pair with regard to the nonterminals: suppose that we are to compress a pair ab . If b is a first letter of some $\text{val}(X_i)$ and aX_i appears explicitly in the grammar, then the compression seems hard, as it requires modification of G . On the other hand, if none such, nor symmetrical, situation appears then replacing all explicit abs in G should do the job. Thus, before stating the algorithm, we introduce classification of pairs into ‘easy’ and ‘hard’.

We first formalise the notion, that a nonterminal generates some substring of $\text{val}(X_i)$. We say that X_i generates $\text{val}(X_i)$ starting at position 1; furthermore, if X_j generates $\text{val}(X_i)$ starting at position p and $X_j \rightarrow \alpha X_k \alpha'$, then X_k generates $\text{val}(X_i)$ starting at position $p + |\text{val}(\alpha)|$. Symmetrically, X_j generates $\text{val}(X_i)$ ending at some position. We use this notions only to say that X_i generates pattern ($\text{val}(X_m)$) or text ($\text{val}(X_{n+m})$) at some position.

We say that a letter $a \in \Sigma$ is *to the left* of X_i , if, for some position p , a is p -th letter of $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$ (or $\text{val}(X_m)$) and X_i generates the text (or pattern, respectively) from position $p + 1$; in such a case we say that X_i is *to the right* of a . In the symmetric situation, we say that a is *to the right* of X_i .

A pair of letters ab is a *crossing pair* if there is a nonterminal X_i such that a is to the left of X_i and $\text{first}[X_i] = b$ or, symmetrically, b is to the right of X_i and $\text{last}[X_i] = a$; otherwise ab is *non-crossing*. Intuitively ab ‘crosses’ the symbols in some production $u \text{val}(X_j) v \text{val}(X_k) w$. Unless explicitly written, we use this notion only to pairs of *different* letters.

The notions of (non-) crossing pairs is usually not applied to pairs of the form aa , instead, for a letter $a \in \Sigma$ we say that a^ℓ is a a 's *maximal block* of length ℓ , if there exist two letters $x, y \in \Sigma$, where $x \neq a \neq y$ such that $xa^\ell y$ is a substring of $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$ (or $\text{val}(X_m)$). We say that a letter $a \in \Sigma$ *has a crossing block*, if the pair aa is crossing. The crossing pairs and letters with crossing blocks are intuitively hard to compress.

The definition of the crossing pairs (and letters with crossing blocks) is very ‘global’ in the sense that it uses $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$ and $\text{val}(X_m)$. However, it turns out that the set of crossing (non-crossing) pairs, letter with (without) crossing blocks can be easily established by reading G . The number of such pairs (blocks) is linear.

Lemma 1. *There are at most $2(n+m)$ different letters with crossing blocks and at most $4(n+m)$ different crossing-pairs and at most $|G|$ noncrossing pairs. For a letter a there are at most $|G| + 4(n+m)$ different lengths of a 's maximal blocks in $\text{val}(X_1), \dots, \text{val}(X_{n+m})$.*

The set of crossing (non-crossing) pairs can be calculated in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.

Outline of the algorithm

The main operations of our algorithm are two types of compressions performed on strings encoded by G :

pair compression of ab For two different letters ab appearing in $\text{val}(X_m)$ replace each of ab in $\text{val}(X_1), \dots, \text{val}(X_{n+m})$ by a fresh letter c .

a 's block compression For each maximal block a^ℓ , with $\ell > 1$, that appears in $\text{val}(X_m)$, replace all a^ℓ s in $\text{val}(X_1), \dots, \text{val}(X_{n+m})$ by a fresh letter a_ℓ .

We adopt the following notational convention throughout rest of the paper: whenever we refer to a letter a_ℓ , it means that the last blocks compression was done for a and a_ℓ is the letter that replaced a^ℓ .

We call the ℓ th iteration of the main loop, i.e. the one in line 1, the ℓ th *phase*. Ideally, each phase of FCPM compresses each consecutive letters into one letter, this gives $\log M$ iterations of this loop. This is true, up to a constant factor.

Lemma 2. *There are $\mathcal{O}(\log M)$ executions of the main loop of FCPM .*

Algorithm 1 FCPM : outline

```

1: while  $|\text{val}(X_m)| > 1$  do
2:    $P \leftarrow$  list of non-crossing pairs
3:    $P' \leftarrow$  list of crossing pairs
4:    $L \leftarrow$  list of letters
5:   fix the beginning and end
6:   for each  $ab \in P$  do
7:     compress pair  $ab$ 
8:   for  $ab \in P'$  do
9:     compress pair  $ab$ 
10:  for each  $a \in L$  do
11:    compress blocks of  $a$ 
12: Output the answer.
```

Remark Notice, that pair compression of ab to c is in fact introducing a new nonterminal with a production $c \rightarrow ab$, similarly, block compression for a introduces new nonterminals with rules $a_\ell \rightarrow a^\ell$. Hence, FCPM creates new SLPs for text and pattern. This justifies the name ‘recompression’ used for the whole process.

Still, these new nonterminals are never expanded by FCPM and are always treated as individual symbols; thus it is better to think of them as letters. In particular, the running time analysis of FCPM use the fact that no new nonterminals are ever introduced to G .

Major challenges

Before we proceed to describing the details of FCPM , we would like to point out, what are the main problems we are dealing with. The non-crossing pair (and blocks) compression are easy to implement and are not an issue: it is enough to read G and replace the appropriate explicit strings. When it comes to a crossing pair compression, a simple transformation of the instance changes the crossing pair ab into a non-crossing one: whenever a is to the left of X_i and $\text{val}(X_i) = bw$ we modify the productions for X_i , so that $\text{val}(X_i) = w$ and replace X_i by bX_i in every rule; similar transformation are applied to the nonterminals X_j to the left of b such that $\text{val}(X_j) = w'a$. This makes ab a noncrossing pair.

Similar approach works for crossing blocks compression, this time though we need to remove a -prefix (a -suffix) from each nonterminal to the right (left, respectively) of a . This removes all crossing blocks of a so that it blocks can be compressed. Notice, that this is all easy to perform, except that we may introduce explicit blocks of a that have exponential length to G . These can be conveniently represented: a^ℓ is simply denoted as (a, ℓ) , with ℓ encoded in binary.

The ends of $\text{val}(X_m)$ have to be treated somehow special: consider pattern abc and text $aabccb$. When aa is replaced by a_2 , and cc by c_2 the obtained text a_2bc_2b no longer contains the pattern, which is still abc . This is fixed by enforcing that the leading pair of the pattern (ab in this case) is compressed as first. The situation complicates, when the $\text{val}(X_m)$ begins with an ℓ -block of a , in this case we tune the block compression a little.

Simplifications

There are some simplifications and additional assumptions made in the extended abstract, done in order to increase the readability; the full version of this paper has no such simplifications nor additional assumptions. *Simplified statements:* The lemmas are stated in a simplified way, omitting some of the technical details, but highlighting the intuitively important properties. *Size of code-word:* We assume that N and M fit in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ code words. This allows the explicit calculations of the *lengths* of $\text{val}(X_m)$ and $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$. In the full version of this paper the same results are shown under the weaker assumption that n and m fit in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ code words.

3 Details

In this section we describe the details of implementation of Algorithm 1 and analyse its running time for such an implementation.

Grammar

The grammar kept by FCPM is closely related to the input one:

SLP The set of used nonterminals is a subset of $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_{n+m}\}$ and the productions are of the form described in (1).

FCPM preserves (SLP), in particular, we always assume, that the input of the subroutines satisfies (SLP). We assume more for the input instance: we want it to obey the Chomsky normal form, instead of the relaxed conditions (1).

Compression of non-crossing pairs

We start by describing the compression of a non-crossing pair ab , as it is the easiest to explain. Intuitively, whenever ab appears in string encoded by G , the letters a and b cannot be split between nonterminals. Thus, it should be enough to replace their explicit appearances.

Lemma 3. *The non-crossing pairs compression can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.*

We read G and list all pairs' appearances and flag them, depending on whether these appearances are crossing or not. We then group these appearances by the pair, i.e. for a fixed pair we have a list of all appearances of this pair. For a fixed non-crossing pair ab , we go through the corresponding list of appearances and replace each explicit ab in G by a fresh letter c .

Algorithm 2 LeftPop (X_i)

- 1: let $X_i \rightarrow \alpha$ and b the α 's first symbol
 - 2: remove leading b from α
 - 3: replace each X_i in the rules by bX_i
-

Compression of crossing pairs

Let ab be a crossing pair because a is to the left of nonterminal X_i such that $\text{first}[X_i] = b$. To remedy this we 'pop' the leading b from X_i : if $\text{val}(X_i) = bw$ we modify G so that $\text{val}(X_i) = w$. This is implemented in LeftPop. Such a procedure is applied to each non-terminal that is to the right of a . Symmetric procedure is applied for a letter b and nonterminals X_i such that b is to the right of X_i and $\text{last}[X_i] = a$.

When the pair ab is no longer crossing, it can be compressed in the way described above.

Lemma 4. *The PairComp properly compresses a crossing pair ab .*

Algorithm 3 PairComp (ab)

- 1: **for** $i \leftarrow 1 \dots m+n$ **do**
 - 2: **if** a is to the left of X_i and $\text{first}[X_i] = b$ **then**
 - 3: LeftPop (X_i)
 - 4: **if** b is to the right of X_i and $\text{last}[X_i] = a$ **then**
 - 5: RightPop (X_i)
 - 6: compress the pair ab
-

Changing all crossing pairs to noncrossing ones can be done in parallel, similarly as in the case of the compression of the noncrossing pairs. However, this can be done under the assumption that these pairs do not overlap, where ab and $a'b'$ overlap if $a = b'$ or $b = a'$. The general case is obtained by partitioning all crossing pairs into $2 \log(n + m)$ groups, such that within each of the groups the pairs are not overlapping. The partition is found by a simple greedy method, similar to approximation of a vertex cover.

Lemma 5. *Pairs from P' can be partitioned into $2 \log(n + m)$ groups, such that performing the PairComp (with appropriate implementation) for pairs in one group takes $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.*

Blocks compression

Now, we turn our attention to the block compression. Suppose first that G has no letters with a crossing block. Then a procedure similar to the one compressing non-crossing pairs can be performed: when reading G , we establish all maximal blocks of letters. We group these appearances according to the letter, i.e. for each letter a we create a list of a 's maximal blocks in G and we sort this list according to the lengths of the blocks. We go through such list and we replace each appearance of a^ℓ by a fresh letter a_ℓ .

However, usually there are letters with crossing blocks. We deal with this similarly as in the case of crossing pairs: a letter a has a crossing block if and only if aa is a crossing pair. So suppose that a is to the left of X_i and $\text{first}[X_i] = a$, in such a case we left-pop a letter from X_i . In general, this does not solve the problem as it may happen that still $\text{first}[X_i] = a$. So we keep on left-popping until $\text{first}[X_i] \neq a$. In other words, we remove the a -prefix of $\text{val}(X_i)$. Symmetric procedure is applied to X_j such $\text{last}[X_j] = a$ and X_j is to the left of a .

It turns out that even a simplified approach works: for each nonterminal X_i , where $\text{first}[X_i] = a$ and $\text{last}[X_i] = b$, it is enough to 'pop' its a -prefix and b -suffix, see **RemCrBlocks**.

Observe that during the procedure, long blocks of a (up to 2^{n+m}) may be explicitly written in the rules. This is conveniently represented: a^ℓ is simply denoted as (a, ℓ) , with ℓ encoded in binary. When ℓ fits in one code word, the a^ℓ representation is still of constant size and everything works smoothly.

Algorithm 4 RemCrBlocks : removing crossing blocks.

- 1: **for** $i \leftarrow 1 \dots m + n$, except n and $n + m$ **do**
 - 2: let $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ be the production for X_i
 - 3: let $a = \text{first}[X_i]$
 - 4: calculate and remove the a -prefix a^{ℓ_i} of α_i
 - 5: let $b = \text{last}[X_i]$
 - 6: calculate and remove the b -suffix b^{r_i} of α_i
 - 7: replace each X_i in rule's bodies by $a^{\ell_i} X_i b^{r_i}$
 - 8: **if** $\text{val}(X_i) = \epsilon$ **then**
 - 9: remove X_i from the rules' bodies
-

After **RemCrBlocks**, every letter a has no crossing blocks and we may compress maximal blocks using the already described method.

Lemma 6. *After application of RemCrBlocks there are no crossing blocks. The time consumption of RemCrBlocks and following block compression is $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$.*

First and last letter of pattern

We have to treat the 'ends' of the pattern in a careful way: consider a text $ababa$ and a pattern bab . Then compression of ab into c results in a text cca and pattern bc , which no longer appears in the text. The other problem appears during the block compression: consider pattern aab and text $aaab$. Then after the block compression the pattern is replaced with a_2b and text with a_3b .

In general, the problems arise because the compression applied by FCPM is done partially on the pattern appearance and partially outside it, so it cannot be reflected in the compression of the pattern. We say, that the compression *spoils pattern's beginning (end)* when such partial compression appears on pattern appearance beginning (end, respectively). In the working example, spoiling of the pattern beginning can be circumvented by enforcing a compression of the pair ab in the first place: when two first letters of the pattern are replaced by a fresh letter c , then the beginning of the pattern no longer

can be spoiled in this phase (as c will not be compressed in this phase). We say, that pattern's beginning (end) is *fixed* by a pair or block compression, if after this compression a first (last, respectively) letter of the pattern is a fresh letter. Notice, that the same compression can at the same time fix the beginning and spoil the end: for instance, compressing ba into c does so in the working example. Our goal is to fix both the beginning and the end, without spoiling any of them.

If the first two letters of the pattern are ab for $a \neq b$, then we can fix the beginning by compressing the pair ab , before any other pairs (or blocks) are compressed. This cannot be applied if $\text{val}(X_m)$ has a leading ℓ -block of letters a , for $\ell > 1$. The problem is that each m -block for $m \geq \ell$ can begin an appearance of the pattern in the text. This is circumvented by applying a tuned version of block compression: observe, that there is no apparent reason, why we needed to replace a^m by exactly one letter. Replacement by several letters is fine, as long as they 'do not mix' in the output. To be more specific:

- each m -block of length $m \leq \ell$ is replaced by a fresh letter a_m and
- each m -block of length $m > \ell$ is replaced by a pair of letters $a_m a_\ell$.

For instance, in the example of $aaaba$ and $aaba$ above we obtain $a_3 a_2 b a_1$ as new text and $a_2 b a_1$ as a new pattern; clearly the pattern has an appearance in the text. In this way we fix the pattern beginning.

When $\text{first}[X_m] \neq \text{last}[X_m]$ then fixing the beginning does not spoil the end and afterwards we simply fix the end in a symmetrical way. When $\text{first}[X_m] = \text{last}[X_m]$ we need to apply a mixture of these two techniques, but still both the beginning and the end can be fixed, without prior spoiling. Roughly, when a^ℓ and a^r are the a -prefix and a -suffix (where, without loss of generality, $\ell \geq r \geq 1$) we first make the block compression of a , in which m -blocks are replaced with:

- a_m for $m < r$;
- $a_r a_m$ for $r \leq m < \ell$;
- $a_r a_\ell$ for $m = \ell$;
- $a_r a_m a_\ell$ for $m > \ell$.

Unfortunately, for some values of ℓ, r (for instance, take $\ell = r = 1$), this might actually enlarge the text (in the example, a is replaced by $a_r a_\ell$). However, by enforcing compression of pairs of the form $a_\ell b$ and $b a_r$ for $b \in \Sigma$ and some simple tricks, the compression can be achieved.

Lemma 7. *In $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time we can fix both the beginning and end without prior spoiling them.*

Grammar and alphabet sizes

The subroutines of FCPM run in time dependant on $|G|$ and $|\Sigma|$, we bound these sizes.

Lemma 8. *During FCPM, $|G| = \mathcal{O}((n+m) \log(n+m))$ and $|\Sigma| = \mathcal{O}((n+m) \log(n+m) \log |M|)$.*

The proof is straightforward: using an argument similar to Lemma 2 we show that the size of each rule shortens by a constant factor in each phase. On the other hand, only **LeftPop**, **RightPop** and **RemCrBlocks** introduce new letters to the rules and it can be estimated, that in total they introduces $\mathcal{O}(\log(n+m))$ letters to a rule in each phase. Thus, bound $\mathcal{O}(\log(n+m))$ on each rules' length holds. Concerning $|\Sigma|$, new letters appear as a result of a compression. Since each compression decreases the size of $|G|$ by at least 1, there are no more than $|G|$ of them in a phase, which yields the bound.

Memory Consumption

FCPM uses $\mathcal{O}((n+m) \log(n+m))$ space, the same holds if we want to retrieve first/last positions etc. of the pattern, under the assumption that N and M fit in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ codewords. If only n and m fit in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ codewords, the space consumption increases by a factor representing the length of text and pattern, i.e. $\log(N+M)$.

Sketch of the main proof

The cost of one phase of FCPM is $\mathcal{O}(|G| + (n+m) + (m+n) \log(n+m))$, by Lemmas 3, 5–7 while Lemma 8 shows that $|G| = \mathcal{O}((n+m) \log(n+m))$ and Lemma 2 shows that there are $\mathcal{O}(\log M)$ phases. So the total running time is $\mathcal{O}((n+m) \log M \log(n+m))$.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Paweł Gawrychowski for introducing me to the topic, for pointing out the relevant literature [13, 15, 16] and discussions [2].

References

- [1] Stephen Alstrup, Gerth Stolting Brodal, and Theis Rauhe. Pattern matching in dynamic texts. In *Proc. 11th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 819–828, 2000.
- [2] Paweł Gawrychowski. personal communication, 2011.
- [3] Paweł Gawrychowski. Optimal pattern matching in LZW compressed strings. In Dana Randall, editor, *SODA*, pages 362–372. SIAM, 2011.
- [4] Paweł Gawrychowski. Pattern matching in Lempel-Ziv compressed strings: fast, simple, and deterministic. In Camil Demetrescu and Magnús M. Halldórsson, editors, *ESA*, volume 6942 of *LNCS*, pages 421–432. Springer, 2011.
- [5] Paweł Gawrychowski. Simple and efficient LZW-compressed multiple pattern matching. In *CPM*, *LNCS*. Springer, 2012.
- [6] Paweł Gawrychowski. Tying up the loose ends in fully LZW-compressed pattern matching. In Christoph Dürr and Thomas Wilke, editors, *STACS*, volume 14 of *LIPIcs*, pages 624–635. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2012.
- [7] Leszek Gąsieniec, Marek Karpiński, Wojciech Plandowski, and Wojciech Rytter. Efficient algorithms for Lempel-Ziv encoding. In Rolf G. Karlsson and Andrzej Lingas, editors, *SWAT*, volume 1097 of *LNCS*, pages 392–403. Springer, 1996.
- [8] Leszek Gąsieniec, Marek Karpiński, Wojciech Plandowski, and Wojciech Rytter. Randomized efficient algorithms for compressed strings: The finger-print approach (extended abstract). In Daniel S. Hirschberg and Eugene W. Myers, editors, *CPM*, volume 1075 of *LNCS*, pages 39–49. Springer, 1996.
- [9] Masahiro Hirao, Ayumi Shinohara, Masayuki Takeda, and Setsuo Arikawa. Fully compressed pattern matching algorithm for balanced straight-line programs. In *SPIRE*, pages 132–138, 2000.
- [10] Artur Jeż. Compressed membership for NFA (DFA) with compressed labels is in NP (P). In Christoph Dürr and Thomas Wilke, editors, *STACS*, volume 14 of *LIPIcs*, pages 136–147. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2012.
- [11] Artur Jeż. Recompression: a simple and powerful technique for word equations. *CoRR*, 1203.3705, 2012. submitted.
- [12] Marek Karpiński, Wojciech Rytter, and Ayumi Shinohara. Pattern-matching for strings with short descriptions. In *CPM*, pages 205–214, 1995.
- [13] Yury Lifshits. Processing compressed texts: A tractability border. In Bin Ma and Kaizhong Zhang, editors, *CPM*, volume 4580 of *LNCS*, pages 228–240. Springer, 2007.
- [14] Yury Lifshits and Markus Lohrey. Querying and embedding compressed texts. In Rastislav Kráľovič and Paweł Urzyczyn, editors, *MFCS*, volume 4162 of *LNCS*, pages 681–692. Springer, 2006.
- [15] Markus Lohrey and Christian Mathissen. Compressed membership in automata with compressed labels. In Alexander S. Kulikov and Nikolay K. Vereshchagin, editors, *CSR*, volume 6651 of *LNCS*, pages 275–288. Springer, 2011.
- [16] Kurt Mehlhorn, R. Sundar, and Christian Urig. Maintaining dynamic sequences under equality tests in polylogarithmic time. *Algorithmica*, 17(2):183–198, 1997.
- [17] Masamichi Miyazaki, Ayumi Shinohara, and Masayuki Takeda. An improved pattern matching algorithm for strings in terms of straight-line programs. In *CPM*, volume 1264 of *LNCS*, pages 1–11. Springer, 1997.

- [18] Wojciech Plandowski. Testing equivalence of morphisms on context-free languages. In Jan van Leeuwen, editor, *ESA*, volume 855 of *LNCS*, pages 460–470. Springer, 1994.
- [19] Wojciech Rytter. Application of Lempel-Ziv factorization to the approximation of grammar-based compression. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 302(1-3):211–222, 2003.

Appendix

A General comments and remarks

Notational convention

In order to distinguish between the input and output of procedures in the proofs, we use ‘primed’ symbols, (like G' , X'_i , α'_i), for the parts of output and ‘unprimed’ (so G , X_i , α_i) for the parts of the input.

Sorting

In the subroutines of FCPM we sort the data several times, since the input can be identified with relatively small numbers, we use **RadixSort** for that. To recall, **RadixSort** sorts strings of digits (we can think of them as numbers without leading zeroes) according to the order:

- if s is shorter than s' than s is smaller;
- is s and s' are of the same length and s_k and s'_k are their left-most different positions then s is smaller than s' if and only if $s_k < s'_k$.

If the lengths of strings are $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_r$ and the alphabet of digits consists of $0, 1, \dots, u^c$ for some constant c , we can sort these strings in $\mathcal{O}(c(\sum_i \ell_i + u))$ time. In all our considerations, c is a constant not larger than 3.

Compression

We denote the string obtained from w by blocks compression for a by $BC_a(w)$ and by pair compression of a pair ab into c by $PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(w)$.

For shortness, we say that some procedure *realises pair compression for a, b* , or *realises $PC_{ab \rightarrow c}$* , if for each $i = 1, \dots, n + m$ it holds that

$$PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X_i)) = \text{val}(X'_i),$$

where X'_i denotes the nonterminal in the grammar after the application of the aforementioned procedure. Similar notion is introduced for blocks compression.

Notice, that if some procedure realises pair compression for a pair ab , where $a \neq \text{last}[X_m]$ and $b \neq \text{first}[X_m]$. (or blocks compression for a such that $\text{first}[X_m] \neq a \neq \text{last}[X_m]$), then the appearances of $\text{val}(X'_m)$ in $\text{val}(X'_{n+m})$ are in 1-to-1 correspondence with the appearances of $\text{val}(X_m)$ in $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$. An appropriate modification for the excluded variant is presented later.

There is a remark to be made: if we perform the blocks compression for a that does not appear in $\text{val}(X_m)$, then we could replace different blocks of a^ℓ with different letters, and for the obtained grammar G' it would still hold that the appearances of $\text{val}(X'_m)$ in $\text{val}(X'_{n+m})$ are in 1-to-1 correspondence with the appearances of $\text{val}(X_m)$ in $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$. Since this property is actually the one we aim at, we relax the notion of realising the blocks compression: if a does not appear in the pattern, we may replace blocks of a^ℓ in $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$ with arbitrary letters. Similar relaxation is done for block compression for blocks b^ℓ , where $\ell > |\text{val}(X_m)|$ and b is not the last, nor the first letter of the pattern.

Furthermore, when fixing the beginning and end, we use a slightly tuned version of block compression, in which a block may be replaced by several letters, not just by one. In such case we still say that a procedure realises the block compression with regard to this variant of the block compression.

Letter weights

In some cases it is useful to consider the *weight* of letters. Weight is extended to strings in a natural way. Every letter a in the input grammar has $w(a) = 1$, while each new letter a that replaces the string w is assigned $w(a) = w(w)$. We treat weights as a tool of analysis and usually do not calculate them. However, when N fits in a constant amount of code words, the weight of each letter can be calculated in constant time.

No neighbouring nonterminals

In the design and analysis and subprocedures it is convenient to assume that there are no nonterminals next to each other in any rule, hence we do so. All described procedures can be extended so that they work also in the general case, however, it is perhaps more explanatory to show that every instance can be transformed into an instance that

- is only constant times larger,
- defines the same pattern and text.

This is done by the following simple preprocessing algorithm.

Algorithm 5 Preprocessing

```

1: for  $i \leftarrow 1 \dots n + m$ , except  $n$  and  $n + m$  do
2:   let  $X_i \rightarrow \alpha$  and  $a = \text{first}[X_i]$ 
3:   remove leading  $a$  from  $\alpha_i$ , replace each  $X_i$  in the rules' bodies by  $aX_i$ 
4:    $b = \text{last}[X_i]$ 
5:   remove ending  $b$  from  $\alpha_i$ , replace each  $X_i$  in the rules' bodies by  $X_i b$ 
6:   if  $\text{val}(X_i) = \epsilon$  then
7:     remove  $X_i$  from the right-hand sides of the rules

```

The analysis of this algorithm is straightforward and is done in a similar way as analysis of **LeftPop** in Lemma 4 and **RemCrBlocks** in Lemma 6, so it is omitted.

A.1 Local definition of to the right and crossing pairs

We say that X_i is *directly to the right* of letter a , if there is a rule $X_j \rightarrow \alpha_j$ such that aX_i appear explicitly in α_j . Similar definition is given for a nonterminal *directly to the left* of a letter.

Lemma 9. X_i is to the right of a if and only if

- it is directly to the right of a
- there is a sequence of nonterminals $X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots, X_{i_k} = X_i$ such that X_{i_1} is directly to the right of a and for each $1 \leq j < k$ $X_{i_{j+1}}$ is the first symbol in the rule for X_{i_j} .

Symmetrical characterisation can be given for nonterminals that are to the left of a letter.

Proof. Straightforward. □

Claim 1. If ab is a crossing pair (we allow the possibility that $a = b$) then there exists a nonterminal X_i with a rule $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ such that

- the string aX_k appears in α_i where $b = \text{first}[X_k]$ or
- the string $X_k b$ appears in α_i where $a = \text{last}[X_k]$

Conversely, in any of the cases described above the pair ab is crossing.

If ab is a noncrossing pair then there is a production $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ such that ab is an explicit substring of α_i .

Proof. The converse implication follows straight from Lemma 9.

Concerning the main implication. Let ab be a crossing pair. By symmetry, we can consider only the case in which there is a nonterminal X_i to the right of a such that $\text{first}[X_i] = b$. By Lemma 9 either X_i is directly to the right of a , which ends the proof, or there are nonterminals $X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots, X_{i_k} = X_i$ such that X_{i_1} is directly to the right of a and $X_{i_{j+1}}$ is the first symbol in the rule for X_{i_j} . However, the latter condition shows that $\text{first}[X_{i_1}] = \text{first}[X_{i_2}] = \dots = \text{first}[X_{i_k}] = \text{first}[X_i] = b$. Hence, $\text{first}[X_{i_1}] = b$.

Consider now a noncrossing pair and a nonterminal X_i such that ab appears in $\text{val}(X_i)$ but not in $\text{val}(X_j)$ for $j < i$. Then ab appears explicitly in the rule for X_i . □

B Omitted proofs

Lemma 1. *Consider a grammar, in which blocks of a letter can be represented as a single symbol. There are at most $2(n + m)$ different letters with crossing blocks and at most $4(n + m)$ different crossing-pairs and at most $|G|$ noncrossing pairs. For a letter a there are at most $|G| + 4(n + m)$ different lengths of a 's maximal blocks in $\text{val}(X_1), \dots, \text{val}(X_{n+m})$.*

The set of crossing (non-crossing) pairs can be calculated in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.

Proof of Lemma 1. Observe that if a has a crossing block then $\text{first}[X_i] = a$ or $\text{last}[X_i] = a$ for some nonterminal X_i . Since there are n nonterminals, there are at most $2n$ letters with crossing blocks.

By Claim 1 if ab is a crossing pair then it can be associated with aX_i , where $\text{first}[X_i] = b$ or $X_i b$, where $\text{last}[X_j] = a$. Since there are at most only $4(n + m)$ such substrings, the total number of crossing pairs is at most $4(n + m)$. On the other hand, by the same claim, if ab is a noncrossing pair then ab appears explicitly in some of the rules of the grammar. And there are at most $|G|$ such substrings.

The argument for maximal blocks of a is a little more involved. consider first maximal blocks that have an explicit appearance in the rules of G , the nonterminals also count for ending maximal blocks. Then each letter (or block of letters that are represented as one symbol) is assigned to at most one maximal block and so there are not more than $|G|$ such blocks, so not more than $|G|$ different lengths. Assign other blocks to nonterminals: a block a^ℓ is assigned to X_i with a rule $X_i \rightarrow uX_jvX_kw$, if a^ℓ is a maximal block in $\text{val}(X_i)$, but it does not in $\text{val}(X_j)$ nor in $\text{val}(X_k)$. Thus, there are four possibilities for a block to be assigned to the rule:

- a letter a from this maximal block is the last letter of u and $a = \text{first}[X_j]$,
- $a = \text{last}[X_j]$ and a letter a from this maximal block is the first letter of v ,
- a letter a from this maximal block is the last letter of v and $a = \text{first}[X_k]$,
- $a = \text{last}[X_k]$ and a letter a from this maximal block is the first letter of w .

Hence, there are at most 4 maximal blocks assigned to X_i in this way.

The $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time algorithm for obtaining a list of crossing and noncrossing pairs is described in Lemma 3 (noncrossing pairs) and Lemma 5 (crossing pairs) $\square$

Lemma 2. *There are $\mathcal{O}(\log M)$ executions of the main loop of FCPM .*

Proof of Lemma 2. We allow a slightly more general version of the compression: whenever a pair (or block) is compressed, we can also replace a preceding (succeeding) letter b with a fresh letter b' and forbid to compress any appearances of b' .

Consider any 4 consecutive letters $abcd$, appearing in the $\text{val}(X_m)$ at the beginning of loop starting in line 1. We show, that at least one of these four letters is compressed before the next execution of this loop. In this way, if we partition $\text{val}(X_m)$ into blocks of 6 consecutive letters, each block is shortened by at least one letter in each iteration of the loop from line 1. Thus the length of $\text{val}(X_m)$ decreases by a factor of $5/6$ in each iteration and so this loop is executed at most $\mathcal{O}(\log M)$ times.

Claim 2. For any four consecutive letters appearing in some $\text{val}(X_i)$ (or right-hand side of production for X_i) at the beginning of the phase at least one of these letters is compressed in this phase.

Proof. We do not distinguish, whether the four letters appears in a rule or in a defined string, as the proof is the same.

Consider 4 consecutive letters $abcd$ and assume for the sake of contradiction, that none of them is compressed during this iteration of the loop.

Consider, whether b is forbidden to compress. If so, then this means that either a or c was compressed, which ends the proof. Similarly, if c is forbidden to compress, then we are done. So assume that b and c are not forbidden to compress. The analysis splits, depending on whether $b = c$ or not.

$b = c$ Then this pair of consecutive letters is going to be compressed in line 11, contradiction. depending on whether bc is crossing or not.

$b \neq c$ Then the pair bc is assigned to either P or P' and is going to be compressed in line 7 or in line 9. Contradiction. $\square$

The proof follows from Claim 2. $\square$

Lemma 3. *The non-crossing pair compression can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.*

The compression of non-crossing pairs introduces at most $|G|$ new letters.

proof of Lemma 3. We go through the list productions of G . Whenever we spot an explicit pair ab , we put $(a, b, 0, p)$ in the list of pairs' appearances, where 0 indicates, that this appearance is non-crossing and p is the pointer to the appearance in G .

For each rule it is easy to list the crossing pairs associated with this rule (see Claim 1): when $aX_i b$ appears in some rule, we list the pairs af and ℓb with flags indicating, that they are crossing, where f (ℓ) is the first (last, respectively) letter in $\text{val}(X_i)$.

Then, we sort these tuples lexicographically, using **RadixSort** in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time: by Lemma 8 the size of Σ is polynomial in $n + m$, and **RadixSort** sorts the tuples in $\mathcal{O}(|G| + n + m) = \mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time. Thus, for each pair we obtain a list of its appearances. Moreover, when sorted, we can establish in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time, which pairs are crossing and which non-crossing.

For a fixed non-crossing pair ab , we go through the associated list and use pointers to localise and replace all appearances of ab . If this pair is no longer there (as one of letters ab was already replaced), we do nothing. For a crossing pair, we do nothing.

If G is organised as a list, the pointers can be manipulated in constant time, and so the whole procedure takes $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.

Since each introduction of a new letter shortens the description of G by at least 1, in total there are at most $|G|$ new letters introduced.

It is left to show, that the described actions are proper, i.e. that they realise PC.

Claim 3. The above description realises the PC for non-crossing pairs.

Proof. Fix the order on the pairs, in which they are considered by the procedure. We show that the procedure realises the pair compression for each of those pairs. So consider a fixed pair ab . Recall that in order to distinguish between the nonterminals before and after the compression of ab we use 'primed' nonterminals, i.e. X'_i , for the nonterminals after this compression and 'unprimed', i.e. X_i , for the ones before.

We show by induction on i that

$$\text{val}(X'_i) = PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X_i)).$$

Indeed, this is true when the production for X_i has no nonterminal on the right-hand side (recall the assumption that $a \neq b$), as in this case each pair ab on right hand side of the production for X_i was listed when the procedure read the bodies of the rules and there is a link to each such appearance of ab (note, that there may be some links to appearances that ceased to exist, as one of their letters was already compressed during the compression of some other pairs). Then each such pair is replaced by c and so $\text{val}(X'_i) = PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X_i))$. When $X_i \rightarrow uX_jvX_kw$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}(X_i) &= u \text{val}(X_j) v \text{val}(X_k) w \quad \text{and} \\ \text{val}(X'_i) &= PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(u) \text{val}(X'_j) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(v) \text{val}(X'_k) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(w) \\ &= PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(u) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X'_j)) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(v) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X'_k)), \end{aligned}$$

with the last equality following by the induction assumption. Notice, that since ab is a non-crossing pair, all occurrences of ab in $\text{val}(X_i)$ are contained in u , v , w , $\text{val}(X_j)$ or $\text{val}(X_k)$, as otherwise ab is a crossing pair, see Claim 1, which contradicts the assumption. Thus,

$$PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X_i)) = PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(u) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X'_j)) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(v) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X'_k)) PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(w),$$

which shows that $PC_{ab \rightarrow c}(\text{val}(X_i)) = \text{val}(X'_i)$, ending the proof of the claim. $\square$

$\square$

Lemma 4. *The PairComp properly compresses a crossing pair ab .*

Proof of Lemma 4. Since we already known from Lemma 3 that for noncrossing pairs the replacement of each appearance of ab in G by c properly realises the pair compression, it is enough to show that **PairComp** makes ab a noncrossing pair, before compressing it.

Observe that **LeftPop** is not fully defined, as it always assumes that the rule for X_i begins with a letter. However, during the proof we show that this is indeed the case whenever it is invoked.

Let, as in the code, b be the first symbol in the rule $X \rightarrow \alpha_i$. Observe that after **LeftPop** (X_i) it holds that

- $\text{val}(X'_j) = \text{val}(X_j)$ for $j \neq i$; furthermore X_j generates the text (pattern) starting at position p if and only if X'_j does,
- $b \text{val}(X'_i) = \text{val}(X_i)$; furthermore, X_i generated the text starting at position p in the text (pattern) if and only if b is the letter at position p in the text (pattern, respectively) and X'_i generates the text (pattern, respectively) starting from position $p + 1$.

In particular, a is no longer to the left of X'_i .

Hence, after applying the **LeftPop** to every nonterminal to the right of a such that $\text{first}[X_i] = b$ the letter a is not to the left of any such nonterminal. Observe also, that **LeftPop** does not change the ‘end’ of the word $\text{val}(X_i)$, i.e. X_i generates the string ending at position p if and only if X'_i does. Symmetric analysis shows that after applying **RightPop** to every nonterminal X_i to the left of b such that $\text{last}[X_i] = a$ the b is no longer to the left of such X_i . Consequently, ab is no longer a crossing pair. $\square$

Algorithm 6 Left-popping a letter for X_i to the right of a , DFS-like style

```

1:  $L \leftarrow$  list of nonterminals directly to the left of  $a$ 
2: for  $X_i \in L$  do
3:   if  $X_i$  is still directly to the right of  $a$  then
4:     LeftPopDFS ( $X_i$ ) ▷ Described below
5:
6: LeftPopDFS ( $X_i$ )
7: let  $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ 
8: if  $\alpha_i$  starts with a nonterminal then
9:   let  $\alpha_i$  start with  $X_j$ 
10:  LeftPopDFS ( $X_j$ )
11: let the first letter of  $\alpha_i$  be  $b$ 
12: remove this  $b$  from  $\alpha_i$ 
13: replace each  $X_i$  in the rules by  $bX_i$ 

```

Lemma 5. *Pairs from P' can be partitioned into $\log(n+m)$ groups, such that performing the **PairComp** (with appropriate implementation) for pairs in one group takes $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.*

Processing one such group introduces at most 4 new letters to each rule.

Proof. We first describe, how one such group looks like, then how to perform **PairComp** efficiently for pairs in one group and lastly, how to make the appropriate partition.

One group $P'' \subseteq P'$ is defined by a partition of alphabet Σ into two disjoint subalphabets Σ_ℓ and Σ_r . Then we consider the pairs $P'' = \{ab \in P' : a \in \Sigma_\ell, b \in \Sigma_r\}$. Notice, that in this way the pairs in P'' cannot ‘overlap’: if $ab \in P''$ then $a'a \notin P''$ for every possible $a' \in \Sigma$ and similarly $ba' \notin P''$. Intuitively, this allows making the pair compressions for pairs in P'' in parallel in ‘one go’.

There are two problems with implementation of **LeftPop**: firstly, we do not know how to identify the nonterminals that are to the right of a , secondly, **LeftPop** is undefined, when we apply it to X_i whose rule begins with another nonterminal. Let us investigate this situation: let X_i be a nonterminal to the right of a and let its rule be $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$. If α_i begins with a letter, then we can safely apply **LeftPop** to X_i . However when α_i begins with a nonterminal, say X_j , then X_j is also to the right of a (note that if X_i generates a string starting at position p then so does X_j). Hence, we should apply **LeftPop** on X_j as well; furthermore, when **LeftPop** processed X_j , then the rule $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ is changed so that α'_i does not start with X_j , but instead with a letter. Furthermore, Lemma 9 asserts that if X_j is to the right of a then either it is directly to the right of a or there is nonterminal X_i to the right of a and with a rule $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ such that X_j is the first symbol in α_i .

The discussion above shows that the loop 2 in the **PairComp**, which pops a letter from each nonterminal to the right of a , can be implemented in a DFS-like style, cf. Algorithm 6: we ensure that each X_i directly to the right of a is processed, furthermore, if a rule $X_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ of processed X_i begins with a nonterminal, this nonterminal is processed before X_i . First observe that **LeftPop** is equivalent to the lines 11–13 of Algorithm 6. Now to show the equivalence of whole Algorithm 6 to the loop starting in line 2 of **PairComp** it is enough to show that lines 11–13 of Algorithm 6 are performed exactly once per each nonterminal to the right of a . It is obvious from the discussion above that they are performed at least once, we show that they are performed at most once. Suppose for the sake of contradiction, that **LeftPopDFS** was invoked two times on some X_i , consider the earliest such second invocation (over all X_i s). There are two cases:

either the second call was done by a recursive call from some other invocation of **LeftPopDFS** or because X_i was in the list L .

recursive call The second invocation is done by a recursive call from **LeftPopDFS** (X_j) for some other nonterminal X_j . This means that the rule for X_j begins with X_i . By the choice of i , this is the first invocation of **LeftPopDFS** on X_j and there was a previous invocation on X_i . However, the first application of **LeftPopDFS** to X_i replaced X_i in the rule for X_j by bX_i , for some letter b , and this b was not removed from the rule for X_j . And thus the rule for X_j cannot start with X_i , contradiction.

in the list As in the previous case, since this is the second invocation the first one replaced X_i in all rules by bX_i for some b . Observe that since **LeftPopDFS** was applied to X_i , $ab \in P''$ and so $a \in \Sigma_\ell$ and $b \in \Sigma_r$. It was checked in the line 3 that X_i is to the right of a , however, b is the only letter to the left of X_i . Thus $a = b$, contradiction, as Σ_ℓ and Σ_r are disjoint.

Hence, Algorithm 6 is equivalent to loop starting in line 2 in the **PairComp**. The loop 4 can be of course implemented in a symmetrical way. The running time will be addressed later on. For now, we show a crucial property, that during the processing of pairs from P'' **LeftPopDFS** is applied to each X_i at most once.

Claim 4. Consider several runs of **LeftPopDFS** for letters $\{a \mid ab \in P'' \text{ for some } b\}$ intertwined with compression of pairs in P'' . Then **LeftPopDFS** is run on X_i at most once in all these calls

Proof. Suppose that it was run twice and consider the second invocation of it on X_i . The condition in line 3 implies that right before the second application, X_i is to the right of some $a \in \Sigma_\ell$. We show that this is not the case.

After the first invocation of **LeftPopDFS** on X_i the X_i was replaced in all rules by bX_i for some b such that $ab \in P''$ for some a . In particular $b \in \Sigma_r$. So right after the end of the first invocation on X_i , the letter $b \in \Sigma_r$ is the unique letter to the left of X_i . Since Σ_ℓ and Σ_r are disjoint, it is not from Σ_ℓ .

There are two ways in which the letter to the left of X_i can change: this letter is compressed or **LeftPop** is applied to X_i . Since we consider the second invocation of **LeftPop** on X_i , by definition there was no invocation between the first one and the second one. Concerning the other possibility: the newly introduced letter by definition is clearly not in $\Sigma_\ell \cup \Sigma_r$.

Hence, a letter from Σ_ℓ cannot appear to the left of X_i , contradiction. $\square$

Organisation of P'' We now describe how the appearances of pairs from P'' are represented. The P'' itself is stored as a list. For a fixed pair $ab \in P''$ we have a list to pointers to all its appearances in G , there are three types of such appearances:

explicit appearance for an explicit appearance of ab we keep a pair of pointers, to a and to b ;

crossing appearance with explicit a for each appearance of aX_i in G , such that $\text{first}[X_i] = b$ we keep a pair of pointers, one to a and one to X_i ;

crossing appearance with explicit b for each appearance of $X_i b$ in G , such that $\text{last}[X_i] = a$ we keep a pair of pointers, as in the case above.

To perform the compression of ab we simply go through the list of ab appearances. When we have a pointer to an explicit pair, we replace it by a new letter c (if both a and b are still there, they could have been compressed by some other pairs). When we spot a pair of pointers to a and X_i we check, if they are still next to each other.

are next to each other We apply **LeftPopDFS** (X_i), which will replace X_i with bX_i . We then replace the newly obtained pair ab by c .

are no longer next to each other This can happen only when **LeftPopDFS** has been already applied to (X_i). In such a case, there is b between a and X_i . We replace this pair by c .

The actions for a third case, when the pointers are to $X_i b$, are similar as in the previous case.

Replacement running time We separately calculate the cost of the replacement of the pairs and the cost caused by the runs of `LeftPopDFS`. Consider the former. Each pair replaced corresponds to one appearance of ab (or aX_i or X_ib) in G . Hence the total cost of the replacement (summed over $\log n$ lists P'') is at most $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$.

Concerning the cost of `LeftPopDFS`, we distribute the cost of calls (including the recursive calls) as follows:

- the cost putting a nonterminal in the list L in line 1 is charged to its appearance in G ;
- the cost of the recursive call on X_i is charged to X_i

Note, that the former cost is in total $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$; the latter is at most $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$, as both `LeftPopDFS` and `RightPopDFS` are run on X_i at most once, see Claim 4. Hence, the total running time is $\mathcal{O}(|G| + n + m)$, as desired.

Creating P' and P'' It is left to show that we can partition the pairs into $2\log(n + m)$ groups, we furthermore show that we can partition them in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$. The groups are found by a greedy algorithm by `GreedyPairs`, see Algorithm 7. It resembles a simple approximation algorithm for vertex cover.

Algorithm 7 `GreedyPairs`

```

1:  $L \leftarrow$  set of letters used in  $P'$ 
2:  $k = 1$ 
3: while  $P' \neq \emptyset$  do
4:    $\Sigma_\ell \leftarrow \Sigma_r \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Organised as a bit vector
5:   for  $a \in L$  do
6:     if  $|\{b \mid ab \in P' \text{ or } ba \in P', b \in \Sigma_r\}| \geq |\{b \mid ba \in P' \text{ or } ab \in P', b \in \Sigma_\ell\}|$  then
7:       ▷ Greedily choose the one that gives more pairs to  $P''$ 
8:        $\Sigma_\ell \leftarrow \Sigma_\ell \cup \{a\}$ 
9:     else
10:       $\Sigma_r \leftarrow \Sigma_r \cup \{a\}$ 
11:    $P''[k] \leftarrow \{ab \mid a \in \Sigma_\ell, b \in \Sigma_r, ab \in P'\}$ 
12:    $P''[k + 1] \leftarrow \{ab \mid a \in \Sigma_r, b \in \Sigma_\ell, ab \in P'\}$ 
13:    $P' \leftarrow P' \setminus (P''[k] \cup P''[k + 1])$ 
14:    $k \leftarrow k + 2$ 

```

Since in each iteration `GreedyPairs` makes a partition of Σ into two disjoint sets, each of the returned group $P''[k]$ satisfies the required condition. Secondly, in each iteration the size of P' halves: this follows by a standard argument applied to the choice done in lines 7–10.

It is left to analyse the running time of efficient variant of `GreedyPairs`, the only non-obvious operation is calculation in line 7–10 as well as creating $P''[k]$ in line 11 (and $P''[k + 1]$ in the next line), all other operation clearly take at most $\mathcal{O}(|P'|)$.

The list P' is organised as follows: for each letter a that appears in some pair in P' we have a *right list* $right(a) = \{b \mid ab \in P'\}$, represented simply as a list. Furthermore, the element b on right list has a link to a list of all appearances of the pair ab in the rules of G (the list was already defined, when P'' was described); there is a similar *left list* $left(a) = \{b \mid ba \in P'\}$. We comment, how to create left lists and right lists later. The right lists and left lists are kept up to date, i.e. after creating P'' we remove the corresponding elements from right lists and left lists. List P'' is organised in the same way as P' , except that it has only the right lists, to avoid having duplicates.

Given $right(a)$ and $left(a)$, performing the check in line 7 is easy: we are to compare the numbers $|\{b \mid ab \in P', b \in \Sigma_r\}|$ and $|\{b \mid ba \in P', b \in \Sigma_\ell\}|$, i.e. calculate the size of the intersection of $right(a)$ with Σ_r and the size of the intersection of $left(a)$ with Σ_ℓ . To this end it is enough to read the $right(a)$ ($left(a)$) list and check for its elements, whether they are in Σ_r (Σ_ℓ , respectively). When Σ_ℓ and Σ_r are organised as bit vectors, this is done in time $\mathcal{O}(|right(a)| + |left(a)|)$.

When partition of Σ into Σ_ℓ and Σ_r is finished, we want to create $P''[k]$ and $P''[k + 1]$ and update P' . This is also easy, we describe only the actions for $P''[k]$, the ones for $P''[k + 1]$ are similar. We read P' again, we read b from $right(a)$:

- if $a \in \Sigma_\ell$ and $b \in \Sigma_r$ we remove b from $right(a)$ in P' and add it to $right(a)$ in $P''[k]$, together with the links to appearances of ab ;

- in other case we do nothing.

When reading b from the left list of a :

- if $b \in \Sigma_\ell$ and $a \in \Sigma_r$ we remove b from $\text{left}(a)$;
- in other cases we do nothing.

We add the appearances only to $\text{right}(a)$ according to the definition of P'' , in this ways we avoid duplication. Again, these operations can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|\text{right}(a)| + |\text{left}(a)|)$.

Since $\sum_{a \in \Sigma} |\text{left}(a)| + |\text{right}(a)| = |P'|$, we obtain that the creation of P'' and update of P' take $\mathcal{O}(|P'|)$ time. Since the number of pairs in P' halves in each iteration, this yields a total running time of $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$, as initially P' has $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ elements, see Lemma 1.

It remains to show how to initially create P' . This is done similarly as creating a list of noncrossing pairs in Lemma 3, we sketch it for completeness. To this end we read G , when reading a pair ab we create a record $(a, b, 1, p)$, where p is a pair of pointers to this appearance and 1 denotes that this appearance of ab is noncrossing. When reading aX_i , where $\text{first}[X_i] = b$, we create a record $(a, b, 0, p)$ as before, where 0 denotes that this pair is crossing; we create a similar record for X_jb , where $\text{last}[X_j] = a$. We then sort these record lexicographically using **RadixSort**. As $\Sigma = \mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m) \log |M|)$ by Lemma 8 and the total number of pairs is at most $\mathcal{O}(|G| + 4(n + m))$, by Lemma 1, this can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$. Now, for a fixed letters a, b , the consecutive tuples with two first coordinates equal a and b correspond to all appearances of ab in G . Reading them we can find out, if ab is crossing or not. If it is, we add b to $\text{right}(a)$ and attach these elements as the list of appearances of ab in G . The left lists are created in the same way. $\square$

Lemma 6. *After **RemCrBlocks** there are no crossing blocks. This algorithm and following block compression can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ and introduce at most 4 new letters to each rule.*

Proof. We first show the first claim of the lemma, i.e. that after **RemCrBlocks** there are no letters with crossing blocks. This follows from two observations:

1. when **RemCrBlocks** considers X_i then for $j \neq i$ the $\text{val}(X_j)$ does not change, i.e. $\text{val}(X_j) = \text{val}(X'_j)$. Furthermore, X_j generates a string starting (ending) at position p if and only if X'_j does.
2. after **RemCrBlocks** considered X_i , and X_i is to the left (right) of a then $a \neq \text{first}[X_i]$ ($\text{last}[X_i] \neq a$, respectively).

Both properties follow by a simple induction on the number i of considered nonterminal.

We infer from these observations that after **RemCrBlocks** there are no crossing blocks in G . Suppose for the sake of contradiction, that there are; let a be the letter that has a crossing block. By symmetry we consider only the case, when there is X_i such that $a = \text{first}[X_i]$ and X_i is to the right of a . Let p be the position such that a is on this position and X_i generates the string starting at position $p + 1$. By the observation 1 during the whole run of **RemCrBlocks** a is on position p . Consider the i -th iteration of **RemCrBlocks**, when X_i is considered. Then in all iteration after the i -th one X_i generates the string starting at position $p + 1$, by the observation 1. Furthermore, by observation 2, right after the i -th iteration, X_i is not to the right of letter $\text{first}[X_i]$, contradiction.

Concerning the claims of the running time, we shall first analyse a simplified version of the algorithms, in which

- we assume that all lengths of blocks considered in **RemCrBlocks** fit in one code word, in particular, operating on these lengths takes constant time.
- we give a slightly larger time bound $\mathcal{O}(|G| \log |G|)$, which is due to sorting.

We then show that using more refined approach we can reduce the compression time to linear one (by using **RadixSort**) and also extend the result to blocks of larger length.

Observe that in this simplified scenario **RemCrBlocks** is performed in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time: assuming that we represent block a^ℓ as a pair (a, ℓ) , the length of the a -prefix (b -suffix) is calculated simply by reading the rule until a symbol other than $\text{first}[X_i]$ ($\text{last}[X_i]$, respectively) is found. Since there are at most 4 symbols introduced by **RemCrBlocks** to the rule, this takes at most $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time. The replacement of X_i by $a^{\ell_i} X_i b^{r_i}$ is done at most twice inside one rule and so takes in total $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time.

Note that right after **RemCrBlocks** it might be that there are neighbouring blocks of the same letter in the rules of G . However, we can easily replace such neighbouring blocks by one block of appropriate length by in one reading of G , in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$.

Concerning the compression of the blocks of letters, it is done in a similar way as a compression of non-crossing pairs, see Lemma 3. For the sake of completeness, we present a sketch: We read the description of G . Whenever we spot a maximal block a^ℓ for some letter a , we add a triple (a, ℓ, p) to the list. The p is the pointer to this appearance of the block in G . Notice, that here the nonterminals are counted for termination of maximal blocks.

After reading the whole G we sort these pairs lexicographically, in time $\mathcal{O}(|G| \log |G|)$. We go through the sorted list, for a fixed inner letter a , we use the pointers to localise a 's blocks in the rules and we replace each of its maximal block of length $\ell > 1$ by a fresh letter, i.e. number $|\Sigma| + 1$. Since the blocks of a are sorted according to their length, all blocks of the same length are consecutive on the list, and replacing them by the same letter is easily done.

Since we already know that there are no letters with crossing block, we can show, as in Lemma 3, that this procedure realises the block compression. The simple proof, which is essentially the same as the proof in Lemma 3, is omitted.

General case

As already noted, we should improve the algorithm above so that it takes into the account two additional factors:

- the lengths of the a blocks can be exponential in $n + m$ and so we cannot assume that we can operate on them in constant time;
- the $\mathcal{O}(|G| \log |G|)$ sorting time should be replaced by $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$, this should hold for the large numbers introduced above.

We deal with both problems at the same time, by introducing a special representation of the lengths of a blocks.

However, before giving this representation, observe that we simply cannot consider blocks of letters that are longer than M : in such case, even creating the representation of their length takes more time than $\log M$ and it cannot be amortised in any way. However, such blocks cannot appear in the pattern, and so we may treat them with disregard, as explained in detail below

Letters not appearing in the pattern and blocks longer than M

Consider a letter a that does not appear in the $\text{val}(X_m)$. Then there is no guarantee that if a^ℓ appears in $\text{val}(X_{n+m})$ then $\ell \leq M$. On the other hand, since a does not appear in the pattern at all, there is no difference, whether we replace two of appearances of a^ℓ with the same letter, or with different letters. In fact, we do not even need to replace the a^ℓ by a single letter, we may replace it by arbitrary strings in different places in G (though we do want the new representation to be shorter than the previous one, so that Lemma 2 works even for such ‘sloppy’ compression).

Thus, for a that does not appear in $\text{val}(X_m)$ we perform a ‘sloppy’ blocks compression: we treat each maximal block as if it had a unique length. To be precise: we perform **RemCrBlocks**, but represent a^ℓ blocks as $(a, ?)$ for $\ell > 1$. Then, when replacing blocks of a (we exclude the blocks of length 1), we replace each of them with a fresh letter. In this way, the whole blocks compression does not include any cost of calculating the lengths of blocks of a . Nevertheless, such a modified procedure still properly realises block compression.

Consider now a that appears in $\text{val}(X_m)$, but has blocks of length greater than M in some other $\text{val}(X_i)$. We treat them similarly: as soon as we realise that a^ℓ has $\ell > M$, we represent the blocks as $(a, > M)$ and do not calculate the exact length. The only difference is that we note that they are longer than M .

Representation of blocks

The intuition is as follows: while the a blocks can have exponential length, most of them do not differ much, as in most cases the new blocks are obtained by concatenating letters a that appear explicitly in the grammar. In this way, the length of the blocks can increase in total by $|G|$. Still, there are blocks of exponential length: these ‘long’ blocks are created only when two blocks coming from two different

non-terminals are concatenated. However, there are only $n + m$ concatenations of nonterminals, and so the total number of ‘long’ blocks ‘should be’ at most $n + m$. Of course, the two mentioned ways of obtaining blocks can mix, and our representation must take this into the account: we represent each block as a concatenation of two blocks: ‘long’ one and ‘short’ one:

- the ‘long’ corresponds to a block obtained as a concatenation of two nonterminals, such a long block is common for many blocks of letters,
- the ‘short’ one corresponds to concatenations of letters appearing explicitly in G , this length is associated with the given block alone.

More formally: our implementation stores a list of *powers*, i.e. the lengths of common long blocks of letters. These numbers can be exponential in $n + m$ and so they are stored as bit vectors. In particular, we assume the operations on a power p , including basic arithmetic operations, take $\Theta(\log p)$ time.

Then each length ℓ of the a -prefix a^ℓ is represented as a sum $p + o$, where p is one of the powers and o (*offset*) is a number associated with ℓ . We show that each offset is at most $|G|$, in particular, the operation on it take linear time and it is stored in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ codewords. Internally, a^ℓ is represented as a number o and a pointer to p . Furthermore, some blocks are represented only by offsets; we sometimes think of them as if they were represented by 0 as power and an offset.

We discuss, when the new blocks are represented as new powers, and when as old powers with larger offset. Initially a power p is created for each nonterminal X_i , such that $\text{val}(X_i) = a^p$, for some letter a , we then store p . Next, other powers are created, when we add two powers, i.e. when during the calculation of length we add lengths that are both represented using powers. If we concatenate explicit letter a to a block, we simply increase the offset. The blocks that are created solely by explicit letters a are represented by offsets alone, without a power.

Before proceeding, let us note on how large the offsets may be and how many of them are.

Claim 5. In total there are at most $|G|$ offsets and the largest of them is at most $|G|$.

Proof. Observe that an offset is created, when an for some letter a an explicit letter a (not in a compressed form) is concatenated to the block of as . One letter is used once for this purpose, so there are at most $|G|$ offsets in total. By the same argument it follows that the largest offset is at most $|G|$ $\square$

Since we intend to sort the lengths, it would be good to be able to compare the lengths of two numbers represented as powers with offsets, say $o + p$ and $o' + p'$. Since the powers are so large, we expect that we can compare them by comparing lexicographically, i.e.

$$o + p \geq o' + p' \iff \begin{cases} p > p', \\ p = p' \wedge o \geq o' \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad (2)$$

Furthermore (2) allows a simple way of sorting the lengths of maximal blocks:

- we first sort the powers (by their values)
- then for each power we (separately) sort the offsets assigned to this power.

Unfortunately, (2) need not to be true: Even though p_i and p_j are so large, it can still happen that $|p - p'|$ is small, as they were obtained in a different way. Still, after sorting the powers it is easy to improve the representation, so that (2) holds. To this end we need to perform only two simple operations: let $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots$ be the sorted list of powers. Then we want to

reassign offsets if $o + p_i \geq p_{i+1}$ then we represent $o + p_i$ using p_{i+1} instead, i.e. as $(o + (p_{i+1} - p_i)) + p_{i+1}$

After performing this operations thoroughly, (2) holds.

Reassigning offsets is easy to do in a bottom-up fashion, however, one offset can be reassigned several times (if many powers are close to each other). To avoid several reassignment, we first modify the list of powers, so there are no two powers that are close to each other:

removing close powers if $p = p_{i+1} - p_i$ is small, i.e. at most $|G|$ then we remove p_{i+1} ; consequently, we replace each $o + p_{i+1}$ by $(o + p) + p_i$

As a first step in removing the close powers, we sort them.

Claim 6. Let $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_k$ be the powers that are at most M . The time needed to sort them is $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k \log(p_i) + |G|)$.

This is done by a standard implementation of **RadixSort** that sorts the numbers of different length, the running time is $\mathcal{O}(k + 2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \log(p_i))$, which is as promised. It remains to add the powers that are larger than M : we append them at the end of the list in an arbitrary order.

Define $\Delta_i = p_{i+1} - p_i$. For implementation reasons, we trim it: if $\Delta_i \leq |G|$, we store it explicitly, if $\Delta_i > |G|$ we simply represent it as $+\infty$. Similarly, when $p_{i+1} > M$, we represent Δ_i as $+\infty$. Then given a sorted list of p_i s we can in $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k \log(p_i) + |G|)$ calculate such trimmed values $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots$. This is done by naive subtraction of p_i from p_{i+1} and then by trimming. Observe that such subtraction takes at most $\mathcal{O}(\log p_{i+1})$ time. Now it is easy to ‘remove the close powers’, see code of **FixPowers**.

Algorithm 8 **FixPowers** : remove the close powers

```

1: let  $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots$  be the sorted list of powers, add  $p_0 = 0, p_{k+1} = \infty$  ▷ For simplicity
2:  $i \leftarrow 1$ 
3: while  $i < k + 1$  do
4:    $\Delta \leftarrow 0, j \leftarrow i$ 
5:   while  $\Delta + \Delta_j \leq |G|$  do ▷ If  $\Delta_j = +\infty$  then this clearly fails
6:      $\Delta \leftarrow \Delta + \Delta_j, j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
7:     for offset  $o$  assigned to  $p_j$ , representing  $\ell$  do
8:        $o \leftarrow o + \Delta$ 
9:       assign  $o$  to  $p_i$ , represent  $\ell$  as  $o + p_i$ 
10:      remove  $p_j$ 
11:    $\Delta_i \leftarrow \Delta + \Delta_j, i \leftarrow j + 1$ 

```

it is easy to see that **FixPowers** has the following properties

- the value of the representation of ℓ does not change,
- after **FixPowers** every two powers differ by more than $|G|$,
- each offset is increased by at most $|G|$, so after **FixPowers** the maximal offset is at most $2|G|$.

Now, the reassigning offsets is also easy, see **FixOffsets**.

Algorithm 9 **FixOffsets** : reassigning offsets

```

1: let  $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots$  be the sorted list of powers ▷ Assume that  $\Delta_i > |G|$ 
2: for  $i \leftarrow 1 \dots k - 1$  do
3:   for offset  $o$  assigned to  $p_i$ , representing  $\ell$  do
4:     if  $o \geq \Delta_i$  then
5:        $o \leftarrow o - \Delta_i$ 
6:       assign  $o$  to  $p_{i+1}$ , represent  $\ell$  as  $o + p_{i+1}$ 

```

It is easy to see that

- as each offset is at most $2|G|$ and each $\Delta_i > |G|$, each offset is reassigned at most once,
- the numerical value of the representation of ℓ does not change,
- if o is assigned to p_i then $o + p_i < p_{i+1}$.

The last property show that after **FixOffsets** the (2) holds. Furthermore, the cost is constant per offsets and so at most $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$. In order to sort all lengths it is enough to sort the offsets within groups. To save time, we do it simultaneously for all groups: offset o_j assigned to power p_i is represented as (i, o_j) , we sort these pairs lexicographically, using **RadixSort**. Since the offsets are at most $2|G|$ and there are at most $|G|$ of them, **RadixSort** sorts them in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time.

Running time

Let $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k$ be all powers created during **RemCrBlocks**. Let us recall the costs of dealing with these powers.

- the creation of the power p_i takes time at most $\log(\min(p_i, M))$, as we stop the calculation of the exact value of p as soon as its representation using bitvector is longer than $\log M + 1$;

- the sorting takes time linear in $\sum_{i=1}^k \log(\min(p_i, M))$;
- all other operations have time proportional to $|G|$.

Then $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ is fine, as we upper bound the cost of `RemCrBlocks`, and so we can charge this cost this against it. The $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k \log(\min(p_i, M)))$ is divided between powers: we associate a cost (linearly proportional to) $\log(\min(p_i, M))$ with p_i and then redirect the cost towards the rule, in which p_i was created.

Claim 7. For a single rule, the cost redirected from powers towards this rule during the whole run of FCPM is $\mathcal{O}(\log M)$.

Proof. Let us first consider the cost of dealing with powers that are larger than M and powers for letters not appearing in the pattern. For the latter, we do not calculate the lengths of powers at all, and so they do not bring any cost to the current analysis. The former, however, introduce some cost: if $p > M$ then we spend $\log M$ time when finding this out might take up to $\log M$ time. To be more precise, let p be obtained as a sum of $p' + o'$ and $p'' + o''$. If one of p', p'' is larger than M then we already know it and in constant time mark that p is too large. However, if $p', p'' < M$ then the cost of calculation can be recharged to the larger of p', p'' : one of them is at least $p/2 - |G|$ and so this increases the assigned cost by a constant factor. Hence, we can consider only the cost of dealing with powers that are at most M .

The creation of the rule can remove a nonterminal from this rule, which happens when X_j is in the rule defines a string in a^* . Then the cost is at most $\log M$ and such cost can be charged twice to a rule, as there are two nonterminals in the rule and there is no way to introduce a new nonterminal to a rule.

It can happen that no nonterminal is removed from the rule, even though a new power is created: this happens only, when in the X_i 's rule $X_i \rightarrow uX_ivX_jw$ both the a -suffix of $\text{val}(X_j)$ and the a -prefix of $\text{val}(X_k)$ are represented using the powers of a , moreover, $v \in a^*$.

Consider all such calculations performed on this rule. Recall that we already accounted the cost of block compression of the letters not appearing in $\text{val}(X_m)$ and compression of blocks that are longer than M . Let the consecutive compressed letters be $a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \dots, a^{(\ell)}$ with multiplicities $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\ell$. Lastly, the p_ℓ repetitions of $a^{(\ell)}$ are replaced by $a^{(\ell+1)}$. Observe, that $a^{(i+1)}$ does not need to be $a^{(i)}$, as there might have been some other compression in between.

Recall the definition of *weight*: for a letter it is the length of the represented string in the original instance. Consider the weight of the strings between X_j and X_k . Clearly, after the i -th blocks compression it is exactly $p_i w(a^{(i)})$. However, we claim that $w(a^{(i+1)}) \geq p_i w(a^{(i)})$: right after the i -th blocks compression the string between X_j and X_k is simply $a_{p_i}^{(i)}$. After some operations, this string consists of some p_{i+1} letters $a^{(i+1)}$. Since the operations in the whole FCPM do not remove the symbols from string between two nonterminals in a rule, nor do they decompress the letters there, it holds that

$$w(a^{(i+1)}) \geq w(a_{p_i}^{(i)}) = p_i w(a^{(i)}).$$

Thus $w(a^{(\ell+1)}) \geq \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i$. Still, by our assumption we consider only the cost of letters that appear in the pattern. Hence, $a^{(p+1)}$ (or some heavier letter) appears in the pattern, and so $M \geq w(\text{val}(X_m)) \geq w(a_{p+1})$. Hence,

$$\log(M) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \log p_i.$$

Therefore, the whole charge of $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \log p_i$ to the single rule is in fact at most $\log M$. □

Summing over the rules gives the total cost of $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log M)$, as claimed. □

Lemma 7. In $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ time we can fix both the beginning and end without prior spoiling them. This introduces $\mathcal{O}(1)$ letters to each rule.

Proof. The applied action are essentially different, when $\text{first}[X_m] = a \neq b = \text{last}[X_m]$ and when $\text{first}[X_m] = \text{last}[X_m]$, with the former being much simpler. We describe them separately.

First and last letter are different

We assume that $\text{first}[X_m] = a \neq b = \text{last}[X_m]$.

Fixing the beginning

Let a' be the second letter of $\text{val}(X_m)$. Suppose first that $a' \neq a$. As already described, we perform the compression of the pair aa' . Regardless of whether it is crossing or not, using approach similar to the one in Lemma 3 (for non-crossing pair) or Lemma 5 (for a crossing pair) gives a $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ algorithm for a compression of this pair. Note that virtually no changes are needed in these two procedures: we simply make compression of exactly one pair and not of several pairs simultaneously. This fixes the beginning in this case. Observe, that as $a \neq \text{last}[X_m]$ also the end of the pattern is not spoiled in the process.

So suppose that $a' = a$, let a^ℓ be the a -prefix of $\text{val}(X_m)$. Then we perform the compression of blocks for the letter a . The algorithms described in Lemma 6 can be easily upgraded, so that it considers only the letter a and do not make any changes with regard to other letters. In this way the running time still is $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$. However, there is one change, already described in the main part of the paper:

- each m -block of length $m \leq \ell$ is replaced by a fresh letter a_m ,
- each m -block of length $m > \ell$ is replaced by a pair of letters $a_m a_\ell$.

We should show that in this was no pattern appearance was lost, nor that any new pattern appearance was introduced. So let $\text{val}(X_{n+m}) = w_1 a^m w_2 w_3$ and $\text{val}(X_m) = a^\ell w_2$, for $m > \ell$. Let w_i be replaced by w'_i . Then the new text is $w'_1 a_m a_\ell w'_2 w'_3$ and the new pattern is $a^\ell w'_2$, thus there is a pattern appearance in the new text. The case in which $m = \ell$ is shown in the same way.

Conversely, let $w'_1 a_\ell w'_2 w'_3$ be the new text and $a_\ell w'_2$ the new pattern. Then the pattern was obtained from $a^\ell w_2$ for some w_2 . Furthermore, $w'_1 a^\ell$ was obtained from some $w_1 a^m$ for $m \geq \ell$ (this is the only way to obtain a_ℓ), also, the only way to obtain w'_2 is from the same w_2 . Hence, no new pattern appearance was introduced. Therefore this realises the block compression.

To implement this approach we need to, for each maximal block a^m , known whether $m > \ell$ or not. This is easy, as the block compression explicitly sorts the lengths of maximal blocks, so the ones longer than ℓ can be identified, see Lemma 6. Clearly the modified procedure properly implements the (modified) block compression.

As in the previous case, this fixed the pattern beginning and as $\text{last}[X_m] \neq a$, it did not spoil the pattern end.

Note, that Lemma 2 works with this modified version of the block compression: while we can introduce two letters to represent blocks, this happens for blocks of length at least 3. So we can think that the middle letter is the one that is not compressed.

Fixing the end

We want to apply exactly the same procedure at the end of the $\text{val}(X_m)$. However, there can be some perturbation, as fixing the beginning might have influenced the the end:

- the last letter could have been already compressed, which can happen only when $b = a'$. In this case we got lucky and we make no additional compression, as the end of the pattern has been already fixed.
- the second last letter (say b') of $\text{val}(X_m)$ equals a' and it was compressed, into the letter c (either due to pair compression or block compression). In this case we make the compression of the pair ca' , even though c is a fresh letter. Note, that as c is the first letter of this pair, this will not spoil the beginning of the pattern.

The rest of cases, as well as the analysis of the above exceptions, is the same as in the case of fixing the beginning.

Last and first letter of pattern are the same

It remains to discuss, what actions are applied, when $\text{first}[X_m] = a = \text{last}[X_m]$. We assume that the pattern is not of the form a^ℓ : this special case is dealt with separately in Theorem 1.

Let a^ℓ and a^r are the a -prefix and a -suffix (where, without loss of generality, $\ell \geq r \geq 1$) of $\text{val}(X_m)$. We first make the block compression of a , in which

- m -blocks for $m < r$ are replaced by a_m ;
- r -blocks are replaced with a_R

- m -blocks for $r < m < \ell$ are replaced by $a_R a_m$;
- ℓ -blocks are replaced by $a_R a_L$.
- m -blocks for $m > \ell$ are replaced by $a_R a_m a_L$.

The letters a_R and a_L are different, even if $r = \ell$. A similar analysis as in the case when $\text{first}[X_m] \neq \text{last}[X_m]$ and we made block compression shows that running time is $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$. Furthermore, both the beginning and the end are fixed.

However, in this way we have elongated the strings in the instance, in the worst case, when $\ell = r = 1$ we replace a single a with $a_R a_L$. Our goal is to compress each a_L with a following letter and each a_R with a preceding letter.

As the first operation, we want to make a compression of pairs (some of them perhaps crossing) of the form $\{a_L b \mid a_L b \text{ appears in } \text{val}(X_{n+m}) \text{ or } \text{val}(X_m)\}$. Note, that this list of pairs is already of the form required from P'' in the construction in the Lemma 5, with $\Sigma_\ell = \{a_L\}$ and $\Sigma_r = \Sigma \setminus \{a_L\}$. The list of such pairs can be created in $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$ and in the same time bounds we can perform the compression of these pairs, see Lemma 5. Notice that in this way we do not spoil the end, as $a_L \neq a_R$.

Similarly, we then perform the compression of the pairs $\{b a_R \mid b a_R \text{ appears in } \text{val}(X_{n+m}) \text{ or } \text{val}(X_m)\}$, in the same time bounds. This does not spoil the beginning.

We show that the process of fixing the beginnings and ends in the case of $\text{first}[X_m] = a = \text{last}[X_m]$ can be seen in an alternative way: we perform a usual pair and block compression, but whenever a pair (block) is compressed, we replace a neighbouring letter b with b' and forbid it to take part in the compression. And such restrictions are in fact allowed in the proof of Lemma 2.

We inspect, how the maximal blocks of a are replaced. Consider some maximal a block appearance a^m and letter b (c) preceding (succeeding, respectively) it. Note, that it may happen that $b = c$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\ell \geq r$.

- if $m < r$ then $ba^m c$ is replaced by $ba_m c$ and b, c can be further replaced. This is equivalent to standard compression.
- if $r = m$ then $ba^r c$ is replaced by $ba_R c$ and a_R is then compressed with b into $b'c$ and c can be further compressed. For $r = 1$ this is equivalent to pair compression, for $r > 1$ this is in fact stronger.
- if $r < m < \ell$ then $ba^r c$ is replaced by $ba_R a_m c$, then a_R is compressed with b , and so we obtain $b' a_m c$, and we can further compress c . Note, that for $m > 2$ this is equivalent to performing the pair compression for ba and then making the block compression for the remaining $m - 1$ letters. For $m = 2$ this is equivalent to compression of pair ba and replacing the following a with uncompressible a' .
- if $m = \ell$ then $ba^r c$ is replaced by $ba_R a_L c$, then a_R is compressed with b and a_L is compressed with c , and so we obtain $b' c'$, and we cannot compress b', c' . Note, that this is equivalent to replacing $a^\ell c$ with c' , b with b' and declaring that b' cannot be compressed.
- if $m > \ell$ then $ba^m c$ is replaced by $ba_R a^m a_L c$, then a_R is compressed with b and a_L is compressed with c , and so we obtain $b' a_m c'$, and we cannot compress b', c' . Note, that this is equivalent to replacing a^m with a_m , then replacing b and c with uncompressible b' and c' .

Concerning the weights of the letters in the following analysis (note that replacing a by $a_R a_L$ causes some problems to the weights), we treat fixing the letters as making compression and forbidding the pairs from compression, as explained above. In this way, there is no need to divide the weights. $\square$

Lemma 8. *During FCPM, $|G| = \mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m))$ and $|\Sigma| = \mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m) \log |M|)$.*

Proof of Lemma 8. We begin with showing the bound on $|G|$. Consider a rule of G . On one hand, its size drops, as we compress letters in it. On the other, some new letters are introduced to the rule, by popping them from nonterminals. We estimate both influences.

Observe that Claim 2 applies to the bodies of the rules and so an argument similar to the one in the proof Lemma 2 can be used to show that the size of the explicit strings in the rules decreases by a constant factor in each phase. Of course, the newly introduced letters may be unaffected by this compression. By routine calculations, as the rule's length decrease by a constant factor, if $\mathcal{O}(\log(n + m))$ letters are introduced to the rule, the rule's size is also $\mathcal{O}(\log(n + m))$ (with a larger constant, though). Hence it is left to show that $\mathcal{O}(\log(n + m))$ are introduced to a rule in one phase.

We now estimate, how many new letters were introduced into the a fixed rule of G in one phase. We do not count the letters that merely replaced some other letters (as a compression of maximal block or a pair compression), but only the letters that were popped into the rules.

As first, the subprocedure for fixing the beginning and end is used, by Lemma 7 it introduces $\mathcal{O}(1)$ new letters to a rule. In noncrossing pair compression there are no new letters introduced. Concerning the crossing pairs compression, by Lemma 4 at most $2 \log(n + m)$ letters are introduced to each rule during the crossing pair compression. Lastly, when `RemCrBlocks` is applied, it introduces at most 4 new symbols into a rule. These can be long blocks of some letter, but they are immediately afterwards replaced by one letter, thus, at most 4 new letters are introduced in this way. In total, this gives $\mathcal{O}(\log(n + m))$ letters per rule.

Concerning the alphabet, the time used in one phase, is $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m) + |G|)$, which is $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log(n + m))$. Thus no more than this amount of letters is introduced in one phase. There are $\mathcal{O}(\log M)$ phases, see Lemma 2, and so a bound $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log M \log(n + m))$ on $|\Sigma|$ follows. $\square$

Theorem 1. *Algorithm FCPM returns a $\mathcal{O}((n+m) \log(n+m))$ representation of all pattern appearances, where n (m) is the size of the SLP-compressed text (pattern, respectively) and M is the size of the decompressed pattern. It runs in $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log M \log(n + m))$ time.*

This representation allows calculation of the number of pattern appearances, and if N fits in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ codewords, also the position of the first, last etc. pattern.

proof of Theorem 1. The running time was already discussed in the main part of the paper. Observe that since all subprocedures properly implement pair compression and block compression, no appearances of the pattern are lost or ‘gained’. One spacial case needs some explanation, though: when the pattern is of the form a^ℓ at the beginning of the phase (which can be checked during the attempt of fixing the beginning), we simply perform the block compression and mark appearances of a^m for $m \geq \ell$. In such case this letter represents $m - \ell + 1$ appearances of the pattern.

As noticed, the positions of the patterns are in general hard to calculate, as they may depend on N . However, everything is much simpler, when we can assume that N fits in a constant amount of code words. This is formalised in the second claim of the theorem that regards the operations on the appearances, when N fits in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ code words. Recall the notion of weight of a letter: for each input letter a we define $w(a) = 1$. Moreover, if b represents a compressed string w , $w(b)$ is defined as $w(w)$. Then all weights of letters are at most N and so can also be stored in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ code words and so we calculate them during the compression, with only constant overhead. Then the position of appearances, number of appearances etc. can be calculated using simple bottom-up dynamic programming on the SLPs representing the final text and pattern. $\square$